



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

TEXAS ORTHOPEDIC HOSPITAL
C/O HOLLOWAY & GUMBERT
3701 KIRBY DRIVE STE 1288
HOUSTON TX 77098-3926

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

#19

MFDR Date Received

MARCH 21, 2008

Respondent Name

AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE CO

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-08-4684-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary March 20, 2008: "Texas Orthopedic Hospital billed its usual and customary charges for its services. The total sum billed was \$92,912.86...The claim presented by Texas Orthopedic Hospital was billed in the same manner and at the same rates that it would bill any health plan or insurer... Per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%...the fees paid by The Hartford Medical Management Center, Inc. do not conform to the reimbursement section of rule 134.401...it is the position of Texas Orthopedic Hospital that all charges relating to the admission of [Claimant] are due and payable as provided for under Texas law and the Rules of the Division, as currently adopted and published at 28 TAC §134.400 *et seq.*"

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated April 22, 2008: "Since our client submitted its request for MDR on March 20, 2008, our client received an additional payment in the amount of \$21,652.40 on 4/18/2008. Please find enclosed the Explanation of Benefits reflecting the payment of \$21,652.40, as well as an amended DWC60 form, which we request to be included along with our client's request for MDR."

Amount in Dispute: \$39,051.38

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated April 9, 2008: "Carrier agrees to pay additional reimbursement for implants only – Stop loss does not apply per medical review of docu – additional reimbursement of \$21,652.40 will be provided under separate cover (EOB & check copy)"

Responses Submitted by: The Hartford

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated April 14, 2008: "Sending copy of EOB for resolution to the above dispute."

Responses Submitted by: The Hartford

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated May 9, 2008: "Upon Carrier re-review of docu, Stop loss does not apply for this date of service. Carrier already paid additional for implants upon receipt of implant invoice on 4/11/08. No additional money due carrier paid fair & reasonable"

Response Submitted by: The Hartford

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary Dated September 12, 2011: "Respondent submits this Respondent's Post-Appeal Supplemental Response as a response to and incorporation of the Third Court of Appeals Mandate in Cause No. 03-07-00682-CV...Based upon Respondent's initial and all supplemental responses, and in accordance with the Division's obligation to adjudicate the payment, in accordance with the Labor Code and Division rules, Requestor has failed to sustain its burden of proving entitlement to the stop-loss exception. The Division must conclude that payment should be awarded in accordance with the general *per diem* payment in accordance with 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401 (repealed)..."

Response Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
April 4, 2007 through April 6, 2007	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$39,051.38	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to requests filed on or after January 15, 2007, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 Texas Register 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital for the date of admission in dispute.
 - Effective July 13, 2008, the Division's rule at former 28 Texas Administrative Code § 134.401 was repealed. The repeal adoption preamble specified, in pertinent part: "Section 134.401 will continue to apply to reimbursements related to admissions prior to March 1, 2008." 33 Texas Register 5319, 5220 (July 4, 2008).
 - Former 28 Texas Administrative Code § 134.401(a)(1) specified, in pertinent part: "This guidelines shall become effective August 1, 1997. The Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline (ACIHFG) is applicable for all reasonable and medically necessary medical and/or surgical inpatient services rendered after the Effective Date of this rule in an acute care hospital to injured workers under the Texas Workers' Compensation Act." 22 Texas Register 6264, 6306 (July 4, 1997).
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.600, 31 Texas Register 3566, effective May 2, 2006, requires preauthorization for inpatient hospital services.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- W1 – WORKERS COMP STATE FEE SCHED ADJUST. SUBMITTED SERVICES WERE REPRICED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATE PER DIEM GUIDELINES.
- W1 – WC STATE FEE SCHED ADJUST. SUBMITTED SERVICES ARE CONSIDERED INCLUSIVE UNDER THE STATE PER DIEM GUIDELINES.
- Paid in accordance with: FIRST HEALTH OWNED/ACCESSED CONTRACT
- 16 – CLAIM/SRVC LACKS INFO WHICH IS NEEDED FOR ADJUDICATION. IN ORDER TO REVIEW THIS CHARGE WE NEED A COPY OF THE INVOICE DETAILING THE COST TO THE PROVIDER.
- 45 – CHARGES EXCEED YOUR CONTRACTED/LEGISLATED FEE ARRANGEMENT. THE CHARGES HAVE BEEN PRICED IN ACCORDANCE TO YOUR FEE OR SERVICE CONTRACT WITH FIRST HEALTH.
- 193 – ORIGINAL PAYMENT DECISION IS BEING MAINTAINED. FINAL ACTION. IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 133.250 (G): "A HEALTH CARE PROVIDER SHALL NOT RESUBMIT A REQUEST FOR

RECONSIDERATION AFTER THE CARRIER HAS TAKEN FINAL ACTION ON THE REQUEST.

- W3 – ADDITIONAL PAYMENT MADE ON APPEAL/RECONSIDERATION. REIMBURSEMENT FOR YOUR RESUBMITTED INVOICE IS BASED UPON DOCUMENTATION AND/OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED.

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The supplemental information was shared among the parties as appropriate. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$92,912.86. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its position statement presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitutes unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6).

4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(2)(A) titled General Information states, in pertinent part, that “The basic reimbursement for acute care hospital inpatient services rendered shall be the lesser of:
- (i) a rate for workers’ compensation cases pre-negotiated between the carrier and the hospital;
 - (ii) the hospital’s usual and customary charges; and
 - (iii) reimbursement as set out in section (c) of this section for that admission

In regards to a pre-negotiated rate, the services in dispute were reduced in part with the explanation “Paid in accordance with: FIRST HEALTH OWNED/ACCESSED CONTRACT.” No documentation was provided to support that a reimbursement rate was negotiated between the workers’ compensation insurance carrier American Home Assurance Co. and Texas Orthopedic Hospital prior to the services being rendered; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(b)(2)(A)(i) does not apply.

In regards to the hospital’s usual and customary charges in this case, review of the medical bill finds that the health care provider’s usual and customary charges equal \$92,912.86.

In regards to reimbursement set out in (c), the division determined that the requestor failed to support that the services in dispute are eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement; therefore 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1), titled Standard Per Diem Amount, and §134.401(c)(4), titled Additional Reimbursements, apply. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.

- Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that “The applicable Workers’ Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission.” The length of stay was two days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of two days results in an allowable amount of \$2,236.00.
- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(A), states “When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274).” Review of the requestor’s medical bill finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A):

Code	Itemized Statement Description	UNITS	Cost Per Unit	Cost + 10%
0278	AESULAP PEEK IMPLANT	2	No support for cost/invoice	\$0.00
0278	SPEC IMP BONE OP 1 BMP	1	\$5,000.00	\$5,500.00
0278	AES S4 SCRW 7X40 SW 784	2	\$393.50	\$865.70
0278	AES S4 SCRW 7X45 SW 786	4	\$393.50	\$1,731.40
0278	AS S4 ROD 5.5X70 SW661	2	\$110.00	\$242.00
0278	AS S4 SET SCREW SW68OT	6	\$82.00	\$541.20
0278	SYNT BONE FILLER 40015	1	\$850.00	\$935.00
			TOTAL ALLOWABLE	\$9,815.30

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states “Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time.” A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$417.22/unit for Hydromorphone 20MG/100. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under revenue code 250. For that reason, additional reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The total reimbursement set out in the applicable portions of (c) results in \$2,236.00 + \$9,815.30, for a total of \$12,051.30.

Reimbursement for the services in dispute is therefore determined by the lesser of:

§134.401(b)(2)(A)	Finding
(i)	Not Applicable
(ii)	\$92,912.86
(iii)	\$12,051.30

The division concludes that application of the standard per diem amount and the additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) represents the lesser of the three considerations. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$23,664.80. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the division concludes that the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement, that a pre-negotiated rate does not apply, and that application of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1), titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4), titled *Additional Reimbursements*, results in the total allowable reimbursement. Based upon the documentation submitted, the requestor's Table of Disputed Services, and reimbursement made by the respondent, the amount ordered is \$0.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 additional reimbursement for the services in dispute.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

04/26/2013

Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a *certificate of service* demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.